

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40164 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-202 Year-2019 Thana- MINAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

Chintu Kumar @ Rajnish, Son of Ram Pravesh Sah, Resident of Village -
Sain, Tole Brijlal, Police Station - Kanti, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pramod Rajpati, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Yogendra Kumar, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER**

3 23-03-2022 Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to

remove all the defects as pointed out by office within two

weeks after start of normal functioning of the Court.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.

Yogendra Kumar, learned A.P.P. for the State.

Petitioner in the present case is seeking regular

bail in connection with Minapur P.S. Case No.202/2019

registered for the offences punishable under Section 392 of

the Indian Penal Code. He is in custody since 19.10.2020.

The petitioner has got seven criminal antecedents as stated

in paragraph '3' of the application.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as

per the prosecution story the allegation against the



petitioner is that he along with other accused persons had looted away the bag of the informant on the point of pistol in which Rs.2,50,000/- cash and other articles were kept.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case merely on suspicion. Learned counsel submits that nothing incriminating has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner and till date no T.I.P. has been held. It is submitted that the petitioner is in custody in connection with this case since 19.10.2020.

Learned APP for the State is present and has opposed the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner.

Having regard to the materials available in the case diary showing that at least two witnesses whose statements have been recorded in paragraph '38' and '39' have seen the alleged occurrence and the petitioner has been named as the person who had been involved in the alleged occurrence, coupled with the fact that the petitioner has got seven criminal antecedents and most of them are of similar nature, one of them is a case under Section 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code and almost all the cases are under the



provisions of the Arms Act, this Court is not inclined to
release the petitioner on bail. Prayer for bail is, thus,
refused.

Let the trial be expedited.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

arvind/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.

